

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee
FROM: Long Range Planning Staff
DATE: February 10, 2003
SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of
January 15, 2002 (Meeting #31)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Mary Antle	City of Camas
Jay Cerveney	City of La Center Council Member
Jeanne Harris	City of Vancouver Council Member
Jeanne Stewart	City of Vancouver Council Member
Michael Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member
Bill Ganley	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Debbie Smith	Town of Yacolt Council Member
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Craig Pridemore	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners

Public:

Marnie Allen	Consortium of Clark County Schools
--------------	------------------------------------

Sign-in sheet was not collected, so the attendance at the last meeting is not accurate.

Staff:

Jose Alvarez	Clark County Long Range Planning
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Mary Keltz	Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager
Rod Orlando	Town of Yacolt – EES Consulting
Marty Snell	City of Camas Planner
Bryan Snodgrass	City of Vancouver Planner

1. Introductions

2. Review November 20, 2002 meeting notes

Accepted as distributed.

3. Consider process for developing criteria for selecting a preferred plan alternative.

Pat Lee began the discussion regarding the criteria for selecting a preferred alternative. Lee said that the criteria are a tool to comparatively evaluate the alternatives and to inform the selection of a preferred alternative. Lee added that discussions at the staff and TAC level had resulted in general agreement with the top half of the table, the eight criteria, but that there were some technical elements that are still being discussed and debated. Comments have been received from various groups, including the school districts and Building Industry Association. Commissioner Pridemore reiterated that the task in front of the Steering Committee is to acknowledge whether or not the eight criteria are sufficient to evaluate the alternatives. He would prefer to leave the definition of the criteria for the TAC members to work through.

Jeanne Harris said the City of Vancouver and VPOC feel the top eight look fine. She added that the City of Vancouver submitted a letter seeking more clarity on some of the criteria. Harris added the memo addresses a management issue of the UGA. Harris noted that for many jurisdictions there are issues for annexation that make it difficult and the City of Vancouver is asking for consideration of a joint management agreement for those areas developing rapidly but that are not a part of the city. Harris added that there has been some successful negotiation dealing with some of those issues at the staff level in the Fisher's Swale area.

Marnie Allen commented that the school districts noticed there wasn't anything specific in the list of criteria that would address the impacts on schools and are offering a proposal to have school impacts included. Allen acknowledged that she has received maps that overlay the 5 alternatives within the school district boundaries. She added they need more specific information with regards to: the number of single family and multi-family households projected, student generation rates for the areas that will be served and revenue forecasts within school district boundaries. Lee responded that the revenue generation by school districts is a finer level of analysis that can be provided and that the single family and multi-family numbers can be derived from the information provided and that staff would be able to assist the schools. Lee added that the school districts would be better able to calculate student generation rates.

Commissioner Pridemore asked how the school districts would aggregate the data to breakdown what's good for schools overall. Allen responded that she was not sure she could get an agreement. Commissioner Morris felt the information request was pretty simple, essentially looking for increase in tax valuation in each district.

Commissioner Pridemore added that the difficulty for the Board is looking at schools in the aggregate and determining which plan is best for schools. Pat Lee added that if the point of reference is job producing lands as an asset to each district then there is a market driven location desire that will impact decisions and will create an uneven playing field. Mary Antle said that no one criteria would provide enough information to get at that. Allen added that the school districts don't expect criteria but would like to have a more explicit consideration for the impacts on schools. Commissioner Stanton expressed an interest in having a criteria address the impacts on schools. Commissioner Pridemore again asked how it would be netted out for all of the school districts and added he would like school districts to be treated fairly. Pridemore directed staff to give it a try and see if they can create criteria that measures the impacts to school districts.

Pat Lee made a pitch about the letter from Matt Lewis of the homebuilder's association. The letter indicated that there would be better opportunities to achieve planned densities by looking at less developed parcels, rather than the parcelized rural residential areas. Lee added that under GMA the objective is to bring in more urbanized (parceled) areas.

Bill Ganley raised a concern with the EIS and the criteria suggesting different alternatives. Commissioner Pridemore replied that the function of the EIS is not to identify a preferred but to determine which will have a greater or lesser impact on the environment. Ganley asked if there was any weight placed on the criteria that would suggest a preference of one alternative over another. He was concerned that there was no weight given to the local preferences. Commissioner Morris asked if all the cities agreed on an alternative.

Commissioner Pridemore again asked how do we aggregate in a way that everyone thinks is fair. Ganley asked if the criteria are weighted and how are they weighted?

Commissioner Morris replied aren't we here to do that? Mary Antle added that the criteria are technical without much value and she didn't feel that it could be so black and white. She added that depending on how the criteria are weighted you can make them fit any alternative. Commissioner Pridemore said he didn't think these eight criteria were the end all for the public comment. Commissioner Morris said that a decision needs to be made, we can't go on this way. If what you want is that everyone gets what they want then there is no need for criteria. She added that she doesn't think these criteria are technical rather a value on the importance of each criteria. She asked that the members of the Steering Committee not reject the criteria out of hand, but to take a look at this and see what's important.

Commissioner Pridemore said that there are two issues: 1) Are these the right criteria to use? 2) given these are the right values/criteria are some more important than others? Then we can provide that input to staff and let them create a weighting system. Ganley added that having the chart filled out would be helpful. Commissioner Morris said that she was prepared to rank her criteria: Economic development, minimize environmental impacts, cost efficient delivery of services, schools. She added that we have trouble everywhere, but we don't have an alternative that helps Battle Ground. She likes the discovery corridor, but it benefits the Ridgefield district. Is there any jurisdiction that wants

more people? Nobody does but that's how you get your job allocation. You're going to have to pick one and let the chips fall.

There was a question about the procedural guidelines? Lee responded that he began that at staff level by looking at the procedural guidelines in chapter 12 but there was no consensus on how you apply the criteria. He added that there are a lot of people playing the end game, which makes it difficult to balance all of the interests and not look dictatorial. He added that there is no obligation to choose an alternative that have all the "good" if the one we want has some "poor".

If expansion is to occur in urban reserve areas first there is no criteria that directly addresses that issue. Lee responded that it is addressed in criteria, but that it could be more clearly stated. It's not necessary for expansion into urban reserve be a hard and fast rule but if it is then it becomes higher on the list and will be weighted accordingly. A question raised was "do any of the alternatives not take in urban reserve"? Lee responded that there is some differentiation of each type but there is some policy level decision that needs to be made.

Mary Antle commented that the Discovery corridor makes sense for economic development but not based on the cost of services. Which makes it more complicated to develop criteria.

Discussion ensued on what the most efficient way to take into account the local perspective. It was agreed that the best method to have everyone's interest taken into account is to submit a letter to the Board of Commissioners' commenting on their individual preferences. It was also agreed that the criteria be taken forward as submitted in order to provide an objective information piece to inform the Board's decision. The matrix is to be filled out by staff at the TAC level.

Craig Pridemore said that we recognize these are objective criteria to evaluate and then the cities and schools can write a letter to indicate their position.

Jeanne Stewart asked whether criteria six is a GMA requirement to have a 75/25 split in housing type? Commissioner Morris replied that the 75/25 was a Steering Committee agreement that says a jurisdiction can not have any more than 75% of any one type of housing and that you meet your density requirements.

4. TAC update

Pat Lee shared with the Steering Committee the initial cut of the transportation analysis

5. Next meeting date and time

February 19, 2003 at 4:00pm.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - August 21 2002(#29).doc

